



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/661,696	09/12/2003	David D. Brandt	03AB014C/ALBRP303USC	7375

7590 07/24/2008  
Susan M. Donahue  
Rockwell Automation, 704-P, IP Department  
1201 South 2nd Street  
Milwaukee, WI 53204

EXAMINER
----------

BAUM, RONALD

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

2139

MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
-----------	---------------

07/24/2008

PAPER

**Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.**

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

<b>Office Action Summary</b>	<b>Application No.</b> 10/661,696	<b>Applicant(s)</b> BRANDT ET AL.	
	<b>Examiner</b> RONALD BAUM	<b>Art Unit</b> 2139	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

### Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

### Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 21 April 2008.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**.                      2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

### Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-9, 12-17, 19-21, 23-41 and 45-47 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-9, 12-17, 19-21, 23-41 and 45-47 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

### Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.  
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

### Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All    b) ☐ Some \*    c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
  2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
  3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

### Attachment(s)

- |  |   |
|--|---|
| 1) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)                     | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)           |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____                                      |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)          | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application |
| Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____  | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____                          |

### **DETAILED ACTION**

1. This action is in reply to applicant's correspondence of 21 April 2008.
2. Claims 1-9, 12-17, 19-21, 23-41 and 45-47 are pending for examination.
3. Claims 1-9, 12-17, 19-21, 23-41 and 45-47 are rejected.

### ***Continued Examination Under 37 CFR 1.114***

A request for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, including the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e), was filed in this application after final rejection. Since this application is eligible for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, and the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e) has been timely paid, the finality of the previous Office action has been withdrawn pursuant to 37 CFR 1.114. Applicant's submission filed on 21 April 2008 has been entered.

### ***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102***

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

4. Claims 1-9, 12-17, 19-21, 23-41 and 45-47 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Swiler et al, U.S. Patent 7,013,395 B1.
5. As per claim 1; "A security analysis tool for an automation system, comprising:  
an interface component to generate

a description of one or more industrial controllers, wherein

the description includes at least one of

shop floor access patterns,

Intranet access patterns,

Internet access patterns, and

wireless access patterns [*ABSTRACT, figures 1-2 and associated descriptions, col. 3, lines 10-col. 9, line 19, whereas the provided computer system analysis tool using inputted computer system/network configuration/topology (i.e., description of **factory assets** whereas factory automation IT/network elements involved in the operation of a given commercial/industrial/government environment (e.g., col. 1, lines 24-45, col. 5, lines 30-55) encompasses the use of at the very least programmable logic controllers of which industrial controllers are an associated architecture), clearly dealing with Intranet and Internet access patterns insofar as network security per se is concerned) and attack template (i.e., model) information dealing with hypothesized attack scenario(s), such that results used to evaluate/make configuration changes in the network to counter vulnerabilities as a function of the risks and costs associated with the changes recommended, clearly encompassing the claimed limitations as broadly interpreted by the examiner.*]; and

an analyzer component to generate

one or more security outputs

based on the description [*ABSTRACT, figures 1-2 and associated descriptions, col. 3, lines 10-col. 9, line 19, whereas the provided computer system analysis tool using inputted computer system/network configuration/topology and attack template information, such that results (i.e., post analysis generated security outputs) used to evaluate (i.e., graphed output information)/make configuration changes in the network to counter vulnerabilities as a function of the risks and costs associated with the changes recommended, clearly encompassing the claimed limitations as broadly interpreted by the examiner.*].”.

As per claim 12, this claim is the method claim for the system claim 1 above, and is rejected for the same reasons provided for the claim 1 rejection.

As per claim 16, this claim is the means plus function claim for the system claim 1 above, and is rejected for the same reasons provided for the claim 1 rejection.

6. Claim 2 ***additionally recites*** the limitation that; “The tool of claim 1,  
at least one of  
the interface component and  
the analyzer component  
operate on a computer and  
receive

one or more factory inputs

that provide the description.”.

The teachings of Swiler et al are directed towards such limitations (i.e., ABSTRACT, figures 1-2 and associated descriptions, col. 3, lines 10-col. 9, line 19, whereas the provided computer system analysis tool using inputted (i.e., interface component) computer system/network configuration/topology (i.e., description of factory assets) and attack template (i.e., model) information dealing with hypothesized attack scenario(s), such that results used to evaluate/make configuration changes in the network to counter vulnerabilities as a function of the risks and costs associated with the changes recommended, clearly encompassing the claimed limitations as broadly interpreted by the examiner.).

7. Claim 3 *additionally recites* the limitation that; “The tool of claim 2,  
the factory inputs include  
user input,  
model inputs,  
schemas,  
formulas,  
equations,  
files,  
maps, and  
codes.”.

Art Unit: 2139

The teachings of Swiler et al are directed towards such limitations (i.e., ABSTRACT, figures 1-2 and associated descriptions, col. 3, lines 10-col. 9, line 19, whereas the provided computer system analysis tool using inputted (i.e., interface component utilizing, at the very least, user input, model inputs, files, maps, and codes) computer system/network configuration/topology (i.e., description of factory assets) and attack template (i.e., model) information dealing with hypothesized attack scenario(s), such that results used to evaluate/make configuration changes in the network to counter vulnerabilities as a function of the risks and costs associated with the changes recommended, clearly encompassing the claimed limitations as broadly interpreted by the examiner.).

8. Claim 4 *additionally recites* the limitation that; “The tool of claim 2,
- the factory inputs are processed by
- the analyzer component to generate the security outputs,
- the security outputs including
- at least one of
- manuals,
  - documents,
  - schemas,
  - executables,
  - codes,
  - files,
  - e-mails,

recommendations,  
topologies,  
configurations,  
application procedures,  
parameters,  
policies,  
rules,  
user procedures, and  
user practices  
that are employed  
to facilitate security measures in  
an automation system.”.

The teachings of Swiler et al are directed towards such limitations (i.e., ABSTRACT, figures 1-2 and associated descriptions, col. 3, lines 10-col. 9, line 19, whereas the provided computer system analysis tool using inputted computer system/network configuration/topology and attack template information, such that results (i.e., post analysis generated security outputs) used to evaluate (i.e., graphed output information, utilizing, at the very least, topologies, recommendations, files, rules, configurations)/make configuration changes in the network to counter vulnerabilities as a function of the risks and costs associated with the changes recommended, clearly encompassing the claimed limitations as broadly interpreted by the examiner.).



9. Claim 5 *additionally recites* the limitation that; “The tool of claim 1,  
the interface component includes  
at least one of  
a display output having associated display objects and  
at least one input  
to facilitate operations with  
the analyzer component,  
the interface component is associated with  
at least one of  
an engine,  
an application,  
an editor tool,  
a web browser, and  
a web service.”.

The teachings of Swiler et al are directed towards such limitations (i.e., ABSTRACT, figures 1-2 and associated descriptions, col. 3,lines 10-col. 9,line 19, whereas the provided computer system analysis tool using inputted (i.e., interface component, utilizing, at the very least, input editing tools, and a display output having associated display objects for the results graphic output) computer system/network configuration/topology (i.e., description of factory assets) and attack template (i.e., model) information dealing with hypothesized attack scenario(s), such that results used to evaluate/make configuration changes in the network to counter vulnerabilities as a

function of the risks and costs associated with the changes recommended, clearly encompassing the claimed limitations as broadly interpreted by the examiner.).

10. Claim 6 *additionally recites* the limitation that; “The tool of claim 5,

the display objects include

at least one of

configurable icons,

buttons,

sliders,

input boxes,

selection options,

menus, and

tabs,

the display objects having

multiple configurable

dimensions,

shapes,

colors,

text,

data and

sounds

to facilitate operations with

the analyzer component.”.

The teachings of Swiler et al are directed towards such limitations (i.e., ABSTRACT, figures 1-2 and associated descriptions, col. 3, lines 10-col. 9, line 19, whereas the provided computer system analysis tool using inputted (i.e., interface component, utilizing, at the very least, GUI oriented input editing tools, and a display output having associated display objects for the results graphic output) computer system/network configuration/topology (i.e., description of factory assets) and attack template (i.e., model) information dealing with hypothesized attack scenario(s), such that results used to evaluate/make configuration changes in the network to counter vulnerabilities as a function of the risks and costs associated with the changes recommended, clearly encompassing the claimed limitations as broadly interpreted by the examiner.).

11. Claim 7 *additionally recites* the limitation that; “The tool of claim 5,

the at least one inputs includes

receiving user commands from

a mouse,

keyboard,

speech input,

web site,

remote web service,

camera, and

video input

to affect operations of

the interface component and  
the analyzer component.”.

The teachings of Swiler et al are directed towards such limitations (i.e., ABSTRACT, figures 1-2 and associated descriptions, col. 3, lines 10-col. 9, line 19, whereas the provided computer system analysis tool using inputted (i.e., interface component, utilizing, at the very least, GUI oriented input editing tools, and a display output having associated display objects for the results graphic output) computer system/network configuration/topology (i.e., description of factory assets) and attack template (i.e., model) information dealing with hypothesized attack scenario(s), such that results used to evaluate/make configuration changes in the network to counter vulnerabilities as a function of the risks and costs associated with the changes recommended, clearly encompassing the claimed limitations as broadly interpreted by the examiner.).

12. Claim 8 *additionally recites* the limitation that; “The tool of claim 1,  
the description includes  
a model of one or more industrial automation assets  
to be protected and  
associated network pathways  
to access the industrial automation assets.”.

The teachings of Swiler et al are directed towards such limitations (i.e., ABSTRACT, figures 1-2 and associated descriptions, col. 3, lines 10-col. 9, line 19, whereas the provided computer system analysis tool using inputted computer system/network configuration/topology (i.e., description of **factory assets** whereas factory automation IT/network elements involved in the operation of a

given commercial/industrial/government environment (e.g., col. 1, lines 24-45, col. 5, lines 30-55) encompasses the use of at the very least programmable logic controllers of which industrial controllers are an associated architecture) and attack template (i.e., model) information dealing with hypothesized attack scenario(s), such that results used to evaluate/make configuration changes in the network to counter vulnerabilities as a function of the risks and costs associated with the changes recommended, clearly encompassing the claimed limitations as broadly interpreted by the examiner.).

13. Claim 9 *additionally recites* the limitation that; “The tool of claim 1,  
the description  
includes at least one of  
risk data and  
cost data  
that is employed by  
the analyzer component  
to determine suitable security measures.”.

The teachings of Swiler et al are directed towards such limitations (i.e., ABSTRACT, figures 1-2 and associated descriptions, col. 3, lines 10-col. 9, line 19, whereas the provided computer system analysis tool using inputted computer system/network configuration/topology (i.e., description of factory assets) and attack template (i.e., model, clearly dealing with risk and effective cost insofar as network security per se is concerned) information dealing with hypothesized attack scenario(s), such that results used to evaluate/make configuration changes in the network to

counter vulnerabilities as a function of the risks and costs associated with the changes recommended, clearly encompassing the claimed limitations as broadly interpreted by the examiner.).

As per claim 13, this claim is the method claim for the system claim 9 above, and is rejected for the same reasons provided for the claim 9 rejection.

14. Claim 14 *additionally recites* the limitation that; “The method of claim 12, the security outputs include at least one of recommended
- security components,
  - codes,
  - parameters,
  - settings,
  - related interconnection topologies,
  - connection configurations,
  - application procedures,
  - security policies,
  - rules,
  - user procedures, and
  - user practices.”.

The teachings of Swiler et al are directed towards such limitations (i.e., ABSTRACT, figures 1-2 and associated descriptions, col. 3, lines 10-col. 9, line 19, whereas the provided computer system

analysis tool using inputted computer system/network configuration/topology and attack template information, such that results (i.e., post analysis generated security outputs) used to evaluate (i.e., graphed output information, utilizing, at the very least, topologies, recommendations, files, rules, configurations)/make configuration changes in the network to counter vulnerabilities as a function of the risks and costs associated with the changes recommended, clearly encompassing the claimed limitations as broadly interpreted by the examiner.).

15. Claim 15 *additionally recites* the limitation that; “The method of claim 12, further comprising at least one of:

automatically deploying the security outputs  
to one or more entities; and  
utilizing the security outputs  
to mitigate at least one of  
unwanted network access and  
network attack.”.

The teachings of Swiler et al are directed towards such limitations (i.e., ABSTRACT, figures 1-2 and associated descriptions, col. 3,lines 10-col. 9,line 19, whereas the provided computer system analysis tool using inputted computer system/network configuration/topology and attack template information dealing with hypothesized attack scenario(s), such that results used to evaluate/make configuration changes in the network to counter vulnerabilities as a function of

Art Unit: 2139

the risks and costs associated with the changes recommended, clearly encompassing the claimed limitations as broadly interpreted by the examiner.).

16. As per claim 17; “A security validation system, comprising:

a scanner component

to automatically interrogate an industrial automation device

at periodic intervals for

security related data [*ABSTRACT, figures 1-2 and associated descriptions, col. 3, lines 10-col. 9, line 19, whereas the provided computer system analysis tool using inputted computer system/network configuration/topology (i.e., polling/automatically interrogating of network machines (periodic interval scanning) and gathering associated data such as IP address, machine type, operating system, file system structure, etc.,) and attack template (i.e., model) information dealing with hypothesized attack scenario(s), such that results used to evaluate/make configuration changes in the network to counter vulnerabilities as a function of the risks and costs associated with the changes recommended, clearly encompassing the claimed limitations as broadly interpreted by the examiner.*]; and

a validation component

to automatically assess security capabilities of the industrial automation device

based upon a comparison of



the security related data and  
one or more predetermined security guidelines [*ABSTRACT, figures 1-2 and associated descriptions, col. 3, lines 10-col. 9, line 19, whereas the provided computer system analysis tool using inputted computer system/network configuration/topology (i.e., polling/automatically interrogating of network machines (periodic interval scanning) and gathering associated data such as IP address, machine type, operating system, file system structure, etc.,) and attack template (i.e., model) information dealing with hypothesized attack scenario(s), such that results used to evaluate/make configuration changes in the network to counter vulnerabilities (i.e., a validation component ...) as a function of the risks and costs associated with the changes recommended, clearly encompassing the claimed limitations as broadly interpreted by the examiner.*].”.

As per claim 26, this claim is the method claim for the system claim 17 above, and is rejected for the same reasons provided for the claim 17 rejection.

As per claim 30, this claim is the means plus function claim for the system claim 17 above, and is rejected for the same reasons provided for the claim 17 rejection.

17. Claim 19 ***additionally recites*** the limitation that; “The system of claim 17,

the validation component performs at least one of

- a security audit,
- a vulnerability scan,
- a revision check,
- an improper configuration check,
- file system check,
- a registry check,
- a database permissions check,
- a user privileges check,
- a password check, and
- an account policy check.”.

The teachings of Swiler et al are directed towards such limitations (i.e., ABSTRACT, figures 1-2 and associated descriptions, col. 3, lines 10-col. 9, line 19, whereas the provided computer system analysis tool using inputted computer system/network configuration/topology and attack template information dealing with hypothesized attack scenario(s), such that results used to evaluate/make configuration changes in the network to counter vulnerabilities as a function of the risks and costs associated with the changes recommended (i.e., validation component, insofar as associated with improper configuration, vulnerability, file system check, user privileges check, etc.), clearly encompassing the claimed limitations as broadly interpreted by the examiner.).

18. Claim 20 *additionally recites* the limitation that; “The system of claim 17,

the security guidelines

are automatically determined.”.

The teachings of Swiler et al are directed towards such limitations (i.e., ABSTRACT, figures 1-2 and associated descriptions, col. 3, lines 10-col. 9, line 19, whereas the provided computer system analysis tool using inputted computer system/network configuration/topology and attack template information dealing with hypothesized attack scenario(s), such that results used to evaluate/make configuration changes in the network to counter vulnerabilities as a function of the risks and costs associated with the changes recommended, clearly encompassing the claimed limitations as broadly interpreted by the examiner.).

19. Claim 21 *additionally recites* the limitation that; “The system of claim 46,  
the host-based component performs  
vulnerability scanning and  
auditing on devices,  
the network-based component performs  
vulnerability scanning and  
auditing on networks.”.

The teachings of Swiler et al are directed towards such limitations (i.e., ABSTRACT, figures 1-2 and associated descriptions, col. 3, lines 10-col. 9, line 19, whereas the provided computer system (i.e., host-based/network-based component) analysis tool using inputted (i.e., vulnerability scanner component) computer system/network configuration/topology (i.e., auditing factory assets) and attack template (i.e., model) information dealing with hypothesized attack

scenario(s), such that results used to evaluate/make configuration changes in the network to counter vulnerabilities as a function of the risks and costs associated with the changes recommended (i.e., validation component), clearly encompassing the claimed limitations as broadly interpreted by the examiner.).

20. Claim 23 *additionally recites* the limitation that; “The system of claim 21,  
at least one of  
host-based component and  
the network-based component  
at least one of  
includes  
non-destructively mapping a topology of  
IT and  
industrial automation devices,  
checking revisions and configurations,  
checking user attributes, and  
checking access control lists.”.

The teachings of Swiler et al are directed towards such limitations (i.e., ABSTRACT, figures 1-2 and associated descriptions, col. 3,lines 10-col. 9,line 19, whereas the provided computer system (i.e., host-based/network-based component) analysis tool using inputted (i.e., vulnerability scanner component) computer system/network configuration/topology (i.e., auditing of **factory assets** whereas factory automation IT/network elements involved in the operation of a given

commercial/industrial/government environment (e.g., col. 1, lines 24-45, col. 5, lines 30-55) encompasses the use of at the very least programmable logic controllers of which industrial controllers are an associated architecture) and attack template (i.e., model) information dealing with hypothesized attack scenario(s), such that results used to evaluate/make configuration changes in the network to counter vulnerabilities as a function of the risks and costs associated with the changes recommended (i.e., validation component), clearly encompassing the claimed limitations as broadly interpreted by the examiner.).

21. Claim 24 *additionally recites* the limitation that; “The system of claim 17, further comprising

a component to automatically initiate a security action  
in response to  
detected security problems.”.

The teachings of Swiler et al are directed towards such limitations (i.e., ABSTRACT, figures 1-2 and associated descriptions, col. 3, lines 10-col. 9, line 19, whereas the provided computer system analysis tool using inputted computer system/network configuration/topology and attack template information dealing with hypothesized attack scenario(s), such that results used to evaluate/make configuration changes in the network to counter vulnerabilities as a function of the risks and costs associated with the changes recommended (i.e., automatically initiate a security action), clearly encompassing the claimed limitations as broadly interpreted by the examiner.).

22. Claim 25 *additionally recites* the limitation that; “The system of claim 24,  
the security action includes at least one of

- automatically correcting security problems,
- automatically adjusting security parameters,
- altering network traffic patterns,
- add security components,
- removing security components,
- firing alarms,
- automatically notifying entities about detected problems and concerns,
- generating an error or log file,
- generating a schema,
- generating data to re-configure or re-route network connections,
- updating a database, and
- updating a remote site.”.

The teachings of Swiler et al are directed towards such limitations (i.e., ABSTRACT, figures 1-2 and associated descriptions, col. 3,lines 10-col. 9,line 19, whereas the provided computer system analysis tool using inputted computer system/network configuration/topology and attack template information, such that results (i.e., post analysis generated security outputs) used to evaluate (i.e., graphed output information, utilizing, at the very least, topologies, automatically notifying entities about detected problems and concerns, generating an error or log file, generating data to re-configure or re-route network connections, updating a database, etc.,)/make configuration changes in the network to counter vulnerabilities as a function of the risks and

costs associated with the changes recommended, clearly encompassing the claimed limitations as broadly interpreted by the examiner.).

23. Claim 27 *additionally recites* the limitation that; “The method of claim 26, further comprising at least one of:

- checking for
  - susceptibility to network-based attacks;
- searching for
  - open TCP/UDP ports; and
- scanning for
  - vulnerable network services.”.

The teachings of Swiler et al are directed towards such limitations (i.e., ABSTRACT, figures 1-2 and associated descriptions, col. 3, lines 10-col. 9, line 19, whereas the provided computer system (i.e., host-based/network-based component) analysis tool using inputted (i.e., vulnerability scanner component) computer system/network configuration/topology (i.e., auditing factory assets) and attack template (i.e., model) information dealing with hypothesized attack scenario(s), such that results used to evaluate/make configuration changes in the network to counter vulnerabilities as a function of the risks and costs associated with the changes recommended (i.e., validation component), clearly encompassing the claimed limitations as broadly interpreted by the examiner.).

24. Claim 28 *additionally recites* the limitation that; “The method of claim 26, further comprising at least one of:

- automatically performing security assessments;
- automatically performing security compliance checks; and
- automatically performing security vulnerability scanning.”.

The teachings of Swiler et al are directed towards such limitations (i.e., ABSTRACT, figures 1-2 and associated descriptions, col. 3, lines 10-col. 9, line 19, whereas the provided computer system analysis tool using inputted computer system/network configuration/topology and attack template information dealing with hypothesized attack scenario(s), such that results used to evaluate/make configuration changes in the network to counter vulnerabilities as a function of the risks and costs associated with the changes recommended (i.e., automatically performing security assessments, etc.), clearly encompassing the claimed limitations as broadly interpreted by the examiner.).

25. Claim 29 *additionally recites* the limitation that; “The method of claim 26, the automated security procedures include at least one of

- automatically performing corrective actions,
- altering network patterns,
- adding security components,
- removing security components,
- adjusting security parameters, and
- generating security data to mitigate network security problems.”.



The teachings of Swiler et al are directed towards such limitations (i.e., ABSTRACT, figures 1-2 and associated descriptions, col. 3, lines 10-col. 9, line 19, whereas the provided computer system analysis tool using inputted computer system/network configuration/topology and attack template information dealing with hypothesized attack scenario(s), such that results used to evaluate/make configuration changes in the network to counter vulnerabilities as a function of the risks and costs associated with the changes recommended (i.e., adjusting security parameters, generating security data to mitigate network security problems, etc.), clearly encompassing the claimed limitations as broadly interpreted by the examiner.).

26. As per claim 31; “A security learning system for an industrial automation environment, comprising:

a learning component

to monitor and learn industrial automation activities during

a training period [*ABSTRACT, figures 1-2 and associated descriptions, col. 3, lines 10-col. 9, line 19, whereas the provided computer system analysis tool (i.e., learning/ monitoring/scanning component) using inputted computer system/network configuration/topology (i.e., polling/automatically interrogating of network machines (periodic interval scanning of automation activities) and gathering associated data such as IP address, machine type, operating system, file system structure, etc.) and attack template (i.e., model) information dealing with hypothesized attack scenario(s), such that results used to evaluate/make configuration changes in the network to counter vulnerabilities as a function of*

*the risks and costs associated with the changes recommended, clearly encompassing the claimed limitations as broadly interpreted by the examiner.];*  
and  
a detection component  
to automatically trigger a security event based upon  
detected deviations of subsequent industrial automation activities  
after the training period [*ABSTRACT, figures 1-2 and associated descriptions, col. 3, lines 10-col. 9, line 19, whereas the provided computer system analysis tool using inputted computer system/network configuration/topology (i.e., polling/automatically interrogating of network machines (periodic interval scanning) and gathering associated data such as IP address, machine type, operating system, file system structure, etc.,) and attack template (i.e., model) information dealing with hypothesized attack scenario(s), such that results used to evaluate/make configuration changes in the network to counter vulnerabilities (i.e., a detection component ... trigger a security event ... after the training period) as a function of the risks and costs associated with the changes recommended, clearly encompassing the claimed limitations as broadly interpreted by the examiner.].*”.

As per claim 39, this claim is the method claim for the system claim 31 above, and is rejected for the same reasons provided for the claim 31 rejection.

As per claim 41, this claim is the means plus function claim for the system claim 31 above, and is rejected for the same reasons provided for the claim 31 rejection.

27. Claim 32 *additionally recites* the limitation that; “The system of claim 31, the industrial automation activities includes at least one of
- a network activity and
  - a device activity.”.

The teachings of Swiler et al are directed towards such limitations (i.e., ABSTRACT, figures 1-2 and associated descriptions, col. 3, lines 10-col. 9, line 19, whereas the provided computer system (i.e., host-based device activity /network-based activity component) analysis tool using inputted (i.e., scanner automation activities component) computer system/network configuration/topology and attack template information dealing with hypothesized attack scenario(s), such that results used to evaluate/make configuration changes in the network to counter vulnerabilities as a function of the risks and costs associated with the changes recommended (i.e., validation component), clearly encompassing the claimed limitations as broadly interpreted by the examiner.).

28. Claim 33 *additionally recites* the limitation that; “The system of claim 31, the learning component including
- at least one of
  - a learning model and

a variable.”.

The teachings of Swiler et al are directed towards such limitations (i.e., ABSTRACT, figures 1-2 and associated descriptions, col. 3, lines 10-col. 9, line 19, whereas the provided computer system analysis tool (i.e., learning/ monitoring/scanning component) using inputted computer system/network configuration/topology (i.e., polling/automatically interrogating of network machines (periodic interval scanning of automation activities) and gathering associated data such as IP address, machine type, operating system, file system structure, etc.,) and attack template (i.e., learning model) information dealing with hypothesized attack scenario(s), such that results used to evaluate/make configuration changes in the network to counter vulnerabilities as a function of the risks and costs associated with the changes recommended, clearly encompassing the claimed limitations as broadly interpreted by the examiner.).

29. Claim 34 *additionally recites* the limitation that; “The system of claim 31, the industrial automation activities include  
at least one of

a number of network requests,  
a type of network requests,  
a time of requests,  
a location of requests,  
status information, and  
counter data.”.

The teachings of Swiler et al are directed towards such limitations (i.e., ABSTRACT, figures 1-2 and associated descriptions, col. 3, lines 10-col. 9, line 19, whereas the provided computer system analysis tool (i.e., learning/ monitoring/scanning component) using inputted computer system/network configuration/topology (i.e., polling/automatically interrogating of network machines (periodic interval scanning of automation activities, such as number of network requests, type of network requests, location of requests, etc.,) and gathering associated data such as IP address, machine type, operating system, file system structure, etc.,) and attack template (i.e., learning model) information dealing with hypothesized attack scenario(s), such that results used to evaluate/make configuration changes in the network to counter vulnerabilities as a function of the risks and costs associated with the changes recommended, clearly encompassing the claimed limitations as broadly interpreted by the examiner.).

30. Claim 35 *additionally recites* the limitation that; “The system of claim 31, the detection component employs
- at least one of
- a threshold and
- a range to determine the deviations.”.

The teachings of Swiler et al are directed towards such limitations (i.e., ABSTRACT, figures 1-2 and associated descriptions, col. 3, lines 10-col. 9, line 19, whereas the provided computer system analysis tool (i.e., learning detection/monitoring/scanning component) using inputted computer system/network configuration/topology (i.e., polling/automatically interrogating of network machines (periodic interval scanning of automation activities, such as number of network

requests, type of network requests, location of requests, etc.,) and gathering associated data such as IP address, machine type, operating system, file system structure, etc.,) and attack template (i.e., learning model) information dealing with hypothesized attack scenario(s), such that results used to evaluate/make configuration changes in the network to counter vulnerabilities as a function of the risks and costs associated with the changes recommended, clearly encompassing the claimed limitations as broadly interpreted by the examiner.).

31. Claim 36 *additionally recites* the limitation that; “The system of claim 35,  
the threshold and  
the range  
are dynamically adjustable.”.

The teachings of Swiler et al are directed towards such limitations (i.e., ABSTRACT, figures 1-2 and associated descriptions, col. 3, lines 10-col. 9, line 19, whereas the provided computer system analysis tool (i.e., learning detection/monitoring/scanning component) using inputted computer system/network configuration/topology (i.e., polling/automatically interrogating of network machines (periodic interval scanning of automation activities, such as number of network requests, type of network requests, location of requests, etc.,) and gathering associated data such as IP address, machine type, operating system, file system structure, etc.,) and attack template (i.e., learning model) information dealing with hypothesized attack scenario(s), such that results used to evaluate/make configuration changes in the network to counter vulnerabilities as a function of the risks and costs associated with the changes recommended, clearly encompassing the claimed limitations as broadly interpreted by the examiner.).

32. Claim 37 *additionally recites* the limitation that; “The system of claim 33, the learning model includes
- at least one of
- mathematical models,  
statistical models,  
probabilistic models,  
functions,  
algorithms, and  
neural networks,  
classifiers,  
inference models,  
Hidden Markov Models (HMM),  
Bayesian models,  
Support Vector Machines (SVM),  
vector-based models, and  
decision trees.”.

The teachings of Swiler et al are directed towards such limitations (i.e., ABSTRACT, figures 1-2 and associated descriptions, col. 3, lines 10-col. 9, line 19, whereas the provided computer system analysis tool (i.e., learning/ monitoring/scanning component) using inputted computer system/network configuration/topology (i.e., polling/automatically interrogating of network machines (periodic interval scanning of automation activities) and gathering associated data such

as IP address, machine type, operating system, file system structure, etc.,) and attack template (i.e., learning model) information dealing with hypothesized (i.e., mathematical, statistical, probabilistic models, etc.,) attack scenario(s), such that results used to evaluate/make configuration changes in the network to counter vulnerabilities as a function of the risks and costs associated with the changes recommended, clearly encompassing the claimed limitations as broadly interpreted by the examiner.).

33. Claim 38 *additionally recites* the limitation that; “The system of claim 31, the security event includes

at least one of

- automatically performing corrective actions,
- altering network patterns,
- adding security components,
- removing security components,
- adjusting security parameters,
- firing an alarm, notifying an entity,
- generating an e-mail,
- interacting with a web site, and
- generating security data

to mitigate network security problems.”.

The teachings of Swiler et al are directed towards such limitations (i.e., ABSTRACT, figures 1-2 and associated descriptions, col. 3, lines 10-col. 9, line 19, whereas the provided computer system



analysis tool using inputted computer system/network configuration/topology (i.e., polling/automatically interrogating of network machines (periodic interval scanning) and gathering associated data such as IP address, machine type, operating system, file system structure, etc.,) and attack template (i.e., model) information dealing with hypothesized attack scenario(s), such that results used to evaluate/make configuration changes in the network to counter vulnerabilities (i.e., security event ... altering network patterns ... adjusting security parameters, generating security data, etc.,) as a function of the risks and costs associated with the changes recommended, clearly encompassing the claimed limitations as broadly interpreted by the examiner.).

34. Claim 40 *additionally recites* the limitation that; “The method of claim 39,  
the at least one data pattern  
employed as input for  
a security analysis process.”.

The teachings of Swiler et al are directed towards such limitations (i.e., ABSTRACT, figures 1-2 and associated descriptions, col. 3,lines 10-col. 9,line 19, whereas the provided computer system analysis tool (i.e., learning/ monitoring/scanning component) using inputted computer system/network configuration/topology (i.e., polling/automatically interrogating of network machines (periodic interval scanning of automation activities) and gathering associated data such as IP address, machine type, operating system, file system structure, etc.,) and attack template (i.e., learning model) information dealing with hypothesized (i.e., mathematical, statistical, probabilistic models, etc.,) attack scenario(s), such that results used to evaluate/make

configuration changes in the network to counter vulnerabilities as a function of the risks and costs associated with the changes recommended, clearly encompassing the claimed limitations as broadly interpreted by the examiner.).

35. Claim 45 *additionally recites* the limitation that; “The tool of claim 1,  
the analyzer component is adapted for  
partitioned security specification entry and  
sign-off from various groups.”.

The teachings of Swiler et al are directed towards such limitations (i.e., ABSTRACT, figures 1-2 and associated descriptions, col. 3, lines 10-col. 9, line 19, whereas the provided computer system analysis tool using inputted computer system/network configuration/topology (i.e., the network partitioned security specification) and attack template (i.e., inclusive of authentication aspects, insofar as sign-on/sign-off, at the very least would be concerned) information dealing with hypothesized attack scenario(s), such that results used to evaluate/make configuration changes in the network to counter vulnerabilities as a function of the risks and costs associated with the changes recommended, clearly encompassing the claimed limitations as broadly interpreted by the examiner.).

36. Claim 46 *additionally recites* the limitation that; “The system of claim 17,  
the scanner component and  
the validation component  
are at least one of

a host-based component and  
a network-based component.”.

The teachings of Swiler et al are directed towards such limitations (i.e., ABSTRACT, figures 1-2 and associated descriptions, col. 3, lines 10-col. 9, line 19, whereas the provided computer system (i.e., host-based/network-based component) analysis tool using inputted (i.e., scanner component) computer system/network configuration/topology (i.e., description of factory assets) and attack template (i.e., model) information dealing with hypothesized attack scenario(s), such that results used to evaluate/make configuration changes in the network to counter vulnerabilities as a function of the risks and costs associated with the changes recommended (i.e., validation component), clearly encompassing the claimed limitations as broadly interpreted by the examiner.).

37. Claim 47 *additionally recites* the limitation that; “The system of claim 21,  
at least one of  
host-based component and  
the network-based component  
at least one of  
determines susceptibility to  
common network-based attacks,  
searches for  
open TCP/UDP ports,  
scans for

vulnerable network services,  
attempts to gain identity information about  
end devices that relates to  
hacker entry,  
performs vulnerability  
scanning and  
auditing  
on  
firewalls,  
routers,  
security devices, and  
factory protocols.”.

The teachings of Swiler et al are directed towards such limitations (i.e., ABSTRACT, figures 1-2 and associated descriptions, col. 3, lines 10-col. 9, line 19, whereas the provided computer system (i.e., host-based/network-based component) analysis tool using inputted (i.e., vulnerability scanner component) computer system/network configuration/topology (i.e., auditing factory assets) and attack template (i.e., model) information dealing with hypothesized attack scenario(s), such that results used to evaluate/make configuration changes in the network to counter vulnerabilities as a function of the risks and costs associated with the changes recommended (i.e., validation component), clearly encompassing the claimed limitations as broadly interpreted by the examiner.).

***Response to Amendment***

38. As per applicant's argument concerning the lack of teaching by Swiler et al of the 'industrial controller' embodiment aspects, the examiner has fully considered in this response to amendment; the arguments, and finds them not to be persuasive.

At the very least, as detailed in the claim 1 rejection above, the Swiler et al teachings of aspects of factory assets, whereas factory automation IT/network elements involved in the operation of a given commercial/industrial/government environment (e.g., col. 1, lines 24-45, col. 5, lines 30-55) encompasses the use of at the very least programmable logic controllers of which industrial controllers are an associated architecture aspect, and generally industrial controller factory assets per se, as *broadly interpreted by the examiner*, and would therefore be applicable in the rejection, such that the rejection support references collectively encompass the said claim limitations in their entirety.

***Conclusion***

39. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from examiner should be directed to Ronald Baum, whose telephone number is (571) 272-3861, and whose unofficial Fax number is (571) 273-3861 and unofficial email is Ronald.baum@uspto.gov. The examiner can normally be reached Monday through Thursday from 8:00 AM to 5:30 PM.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Kristine Kincaid, can be reached at (571) 272-4063. The Fax number for the organization where this application is assigned is **571-273-8300**.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. For more information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Ronald Baum

Patent Examiner

/R. B./

Examiner, Art Unit 2139

/Kristine Kincaid/

Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 2139